M7DHReeS	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
V •	20 Cr. 500 (JGK)
SAMUEL REED,	
Defendant.	Sentence
x	
	New York, N.Y. July 13, 2022
	3:15 p.m.
Before:	
HON. JOHN G. K	OELTL,
	District Judge
APPEARANCI	ΞS
DAMIAN WILLIAMS United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York SAMUEL RAYMOND Assistant United States Attorney	әу
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP	
Attorneys for Defendant BY: DOUGLAS YATTER BENJAMIN NAFTALIS	
Also Present:	
Thomas Gergely, Intern USAO	
inomore del gell, lineelli delle	

25

1 (Case called; appearances noted) 2 THE COURT: I've received the presentence report prepared May 3, 2022, revised May 31, 2022. I've received the 3 4 defense submission dated June 29, 2022, and July 11, 2022. 5 received the government's submission dated July 6, 2022. 6 Mr. Yatter, have you reviewed the presentence report, 7 the recommendation, and the addendum, and discussed them with the defendant? 8 9 MR. YATTER: We have, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Do you have any objections? 11 MR. YATTER: No, your Honor. We noted objections to 12 the draft report, and they're reflected in the PSR. None of it 13 goes to the guidelines range, so no objections, your Honor, has 14 to take up today. 15 THE COURT: OK. No factual disputes that I have to decide for purposes of sentence? 16 17 MR. YATTER: Correct, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: I'll listen to you for anything that you 19 would like to tell me in connection with sentence, any 20 statement you'd like to make, anything at all you'd like to 21 tell me. 22 MR. YATTER: Thank you, your Honor. May I use the 23 lectern? 24 THE COURT: Sure.

MR. YATTER: Your Honor, before I begin, I would like

to take a moment to introduce some of the people here in the courtroom today supporting Sam who have come from all over the country.

From Sam's family, his wife Aggie is in the front row. His mother, Lauren, is sitting next to her. His father and stepmother, Trace and Barbara, are here. His grandmother, Beverly, is there. His father-in-law Frank is here. His brothers-in-law are here, and several of Sam's good friends, several of whom have submitted letters with our package to your Honor, are here as well. Each of them is here because they love and support Sam. I know Sam is grateful for their support, and I'd like to thank them as well for being here today.

Let me start, your Honor, by saying Sam has admitted his role in BitMEX's failure to implement a know-your-customer and anti-money laundering program. He accepts responsibility for his role in this serious misconduct, and he is deeply remorseful.

The Court has heard recitations of the allegations and the facts in this case on several occasions, including twice recently at sentencings for Mr. Reed's codefendants, so I don't intend to go through all those same points again today. But instead, we want to focus on who Sam is, where he fits in the conduct at issue, and how we think those facts should inform the Court's sentence.

I've had the pleasure of getting to know Sam well over the past few years, and I'm proud to represent him here today, as is my team. He's a remarkable individual. He is genuine, he is humble, and he is kind. And he has developed a maturity beyond his years.

He also possesses an incredible intellectual curiosity. As my team will attest, it is not often that you meet with Sam and come away without learning something new on a topic or in a field that you never expected to discuss. But there are two topics that always come up with Sam, and it is clear when he's speaking about them that they are his passions. Those are his family and computer science. I'd like to speak briefly about each of those areas.

As the number of people in this courtroom and the letters submitted for Sam show, he is a dedicated and loyal family member and friend. He is a devoted husband and father, a proud brother, son, uncle, brother—in—law to the many family members here today and around the country in Massachusetts, Wisconsin, and elsewhere. He's also a caring and committed friend.

Although Sam worked hard and found success in his career, his loved ones always came first. Rather than stay in Hong Kong with his cofounders, Sam coded for the BitMEX website while traveling with his wife and then from Wisconsin where the couple moved to be near Sam's family. Later, as they started

their family and had their first child, they moved to

Massachusetts to be near Sam's wife's family. I think that's a

testament to Sam's character and his personality. From the

beginning, he opted for small-town family life over the

trappings of the high-profile cryptocurrency world, unlike his

cofounders and unlike many in the industry. He chose to work

from a coworking space in Milwaukee and a home office in

Massachusetts instead of a fancy high-rise in Hong Kong so he

could be near his loved ones.

Sam has always been generous, not only with his money but also with his time and his attention. As we noted in our submission, Sam has used his money to support others, particularly in the area of education, which is near and dear to his heart. But he's not someone who does good deeds only with a checkbook. As your Honor knows from our submission, Sam's friends have described how he has given his time to help them in their professional and personal lives. One of Sam's friends recalled how Sam flew in to visit her for a weekend when she was ill, and she described how he not only spent time with her but helped her do chores and cleaned her home because she was unable to do so. As she said, and this is in the file your Honor has, that is who Sam is, a man who is genuine, a man who cares, who shuns pretentiousness and remains the solid friend you've always relied on.

I think that describes Sam well. He is the

down-to-earth, shirt-off-his-back type of guy. That was true when he was growing up in Wisconsin, and it did not change when he found success.

I'd also like to talk briefly about Sam's passion for computers and computer science. He fell in love with computers as a young boy, tinkering with machines that his father, who's here with us today, brought home from work. That love stayed with Sam ever since, and it led him to develop exceptional computer programming skills. I mentioned before that Sam is intellectually curious, and nowhere is that more obvious than in discussing computers and technology with him. He takes immense pride in his field of work and is always seeking to grow, learn, and be the best he can be.

He has dedicated himself to programming ever since he was old enough to work. In middle school, he fixed neighbors' computers. In high school, he set up a corporate network for an industrial company in his hometown. In college, at the worked at the student IT help desk. After college, he started out as a programmer for a U.S. Army defense contractor and then had several jobs as an engineer for various companies in Washington and then in Hong Kong.

I'll talk in a moment about how that background led to Sam's role at BitMEX, but before I do, I also want to note that Sam has given an enormous amount to the programming community.

As we noted in our submission, Sam has been one of the most

prolific open source programmers in the world, as measured by GitHub, an industry-leading code repository. "Open source" means Sam's work is public and free. He is adding to the world's library of programming knowledge, and he's doing so at an exceptionally prolific rate.

He also gives back to programmers more directly. At his urging, BitMEX leads the industry in support for open source developers, and as the letters attached to our submission show, Sam was always willing to help those around him grow as coders and help solve problems in their coding.

As another of Sam's friends in a letter you have, your Honor, recounted, he met Sam in a coworking space years ago and recalled that Sam regularly devoted time to help new and old members with their technology problems. This friend added that half the software and hardware at the coworking space only worked because Sam took the time to figure it out. In short, Sam was not only a guy who preferred low-key coworking spaces to high-rise offices, but he was the guy there helping others to succeed.

Now, while I don't want to repeat everything we've written to your Honor, I do want to highlight a few points. As your Honor knows, this is not a fraud case. This is not a case with any victims. No one lost any money. While this case is about anti-money laundering compliance, it is not a case about money laundering. There is no specified unlawful activity on

the platform or use of the platform to hide or move proceeds of any illegal activity, and certainly not any evidence that Sam knew about or condoned such activity. The government cites to suspicion and inquiries in their papers, little or none of which is actually tied to Sam. But more importantly, there is a material difference between what might have happened and what actually happened.

We laid out in our submission why BitMEX was not a platform that would be attractive to a money launderer, and we're speaking here from Sam's perspective. It was a bitcoin-only platform that did not allow bitcoin to be changed or converted into any other currency, and it used unique wallet addresses that marked transactions on the public blockchain visibly and for all time. No other exchange does this even today, and BitMEX remains the most traceable group of addresses on any blockchain.

To be clear, this does not excuse the failure to have a BSA-compliant AML program, but it does provide important context for how Sam thought about the platform.

I make these points because a lot of what's in the government's sentencing arguments are supported by generalities or points that are not tied to Sam, and that matters because today we are talking about Sam. That brings me to Sam's role in the conduct at issue.

Sam has pleaded guilty to one count of violating the

BSA for willfully causing BitMEX to fail to implement an adequate AML program. He has fully accepted responsibility for that offense and is deeply remorseful for the bad judgment in not ensuring that BitMEX have a program like this.

But, importantly, all parties agree that Sam's role in the offense is different and more limited than the role his cofounders played. The government does not dispute that, and it's the reason why the guidelines range in Sam's plea agreement is in a lower zone and for a shorter period than his codefendants.

Now I want to talk briefly about that more limited role.

Before BitMEX, Sam had never worked in the financial industry at all, and he had no experience in finance or in compliance. When Arthur Hayes first described the project to him in 2013, Sam did not even know what financial derivatives were. The division of labor among the founders reflected that. Sam was responsible for the front-end programming, and he left the rest -- corporate strategy, business development, marketing, compliance, and legal -- to his more experienced cofounders. Sam was also on the other side of the world from them and only saw them in person for a few weeks a year.

It's also important to note that Sam's area of responsibility for him was all consuming. When the company's business took off and its product offerings and services

expanded, Sam faced exponential technological demands to maintain and support the website and API in a secure manner. Sam was so burned out from the never-ending work that in 2018, as your Honor knows, he opted to go on a six-month sabbatical. So from September 2018 to February 2019, he had no involvement in the company's day-to-day operations, and when he returned in 2019, it was in a more limited role which he could then do because the company had hired other coders and professionals as a group.

Given Sam's limited role and the lack of financial experience, the PSR and the government both recognize that Sam was not an organizer, not a leader of the company's failure to have an AML program. That's why no leadership enhancement applies for Sam. That's a meaningful difference, and it's based on meaningful factual distinctions. Respectfully, your Honor, we believe it also warrants a meaningfully different sentence.

Now, the government acknowledges that Sam was not responsible as a leader, that he is less culpable, and that he merits a lesser sentence, but the lesser sentence they recommend is, in fact, very similar to Mr. Delo. Mr. Delo received 30 months of probation, and the government recommends 24 months of probation for Sam. Mr. Hayes also received 24 months of probation, of course with six months of home confinement that no one is seeking here today.

The government's basis for its recommendation today is that Sam was a co-founder, earned a lot of money, and is a technologist who they allege was uniquely situated to restrict U.S. customers. Now, I'm summarizing and condensing, but I want to speak briefly about each of those three points.

Respectfully, none of those arguments supports the government's recommended sentence.

First, there is no dispute that Sam was a co-founder, but the title should not impact the sentence. What matters is what his role was, and as we've discussed, his role was focused on front-end technology and not the compliance decisions at the heart of this criminal failure.

Second, the wealth he earned from the company should not drive this sentence. BitMEX operated lawfully in jurisdictions outside the United States, and it offered innovative products that have played an important role in the growth and maturation of the global cryptocurrency markets.

Moreover, the \$10 million fine Sam already paid in connection with his plea agreement vastly exceeds the recommended fine under the guidelines by several orders of magnitude. That stipulated fine was structured by the government to be based on the gains Sam earned from BitMEX even though it was not based on data. In other words, to the extent Sam's earnings are relevant at all, they have been addressed through a fine that far exceeds the guidelines recommendation.

Third, the fact that Sam is an excellent computer programmer does not render him more culpable or justify the government's requested period of probation. Having never worked in financial services or compliance before, Sam helped implement controls based on guidance he received from others. Sam has admitted that the steps the company took to limit access by U.S. users were insufficient, and he deeply regrets those deficiencies. But even the government acknowledges that Sam did not organize or lead those compliance decisions, and the measures he helped implement were not a sham, as the government contends. They succeeded in blocking tens of thousands of potential U.S. users, and they got better over time.

The government points to things like VPNs and Tor as supposed loopholes for these controls, but our submission lays out how those arguments, respectfully, misunderstand the technology and the facts. Those are issues that plague every Internet-based company, including companies with far greater resources and staffing than BitMEX had. And Sam repeatedly himself told users that their accounts would be shut down if they were found to be using that technology to circumvent the company's controls.

At bottom, because of the nature of the Internet and technologies like VPNs, the government's argument is really that the company needed to have a comprehensive KYC program,

KYC procedures, earlier than it did. Now, the company chose to and started developing KYC beginning in 2019, announced it publicly in 2020 before the indictment, before any enforcement action, and then finished implementing it at great expense and cost and did that following through after the indictment, of course.

The lack of such procedures earlier, prior to the beginning of that period in 2019 and 2020 when they began implementing it, the lack of such procedures, which Sam has acknowledged, is not a coding problem that his programming skill could solve. It was a compliance decision for which Sam accepts his part of the responsibility, but for which he was not a leader or organizer. That is a core part of the difference reflected in Sam's plea agreement.

So where does that bring us? As detailed in our submission, we respectfully request that the Court sentence Sam to time served with no period of supervised release. As set forth in our submission in some detail, that's the sentence that would be no greater than necessary to satisfy the factors under Section 3553(a)(2).

I won't go through them again today. I'll just commend your Honor to our written submission, but we would also note that supervised release as a component is not required by the guidelines here. Under 5D1.1(a) supervised release is only mandatory where it's specifically required by statute or where

a term of more than one year of imprisonment is imposed, and neither condition would apply here.

Now, it's also worth noting that despite Sam's lesser role in the offense, he has been subject to the most restrictive pretrial conditions of any of the three founders. Since his arrest in October 2020, Sam has been limited to travel in a small number of states in the U.S. As your Honor knows from our occasional requests, Mr. Reed needed to seek consent from the government to travel to any other states. He also could not leave the country because he had to surrender his passport to the government, which it still holds. At the same time, Mr. Hayes and Mr. Delo were allowed to travel freely throughout their home countries and, in the case of Mr. Delo, in certain other countries as well. This has been the situation for more than 21 months, and Sam's compliance has been exemplary. It further underscores why no additional period of probation or supervised release is necessary for Sam.

So for all of these reasons, we respectfully request a sentence of time served with no period of supervised release.

I do want to add, your Honor, as the government is seeking probation, that if the Court determines to impose a sentence of probation, we would make just a couple of points: First, if probation is ordered, we respectfully request and submit that it should stand alone and, of course, not include any time served or supervised release component. Probation

alone would be more than sufficient, as both the PSR and the government have recommended. And, second, a probationary sentence should be for the shortest period possible.

For all the reasons we've discussed, Sam's lesser role warrants a meaningful distinction in sentences. Mr. Delo received 30 months of probation, and Mr. Hayes received 24 months of probation. Under the guidelines, one year of probation would appropriately reflect the difference in Sam's role if the Court is imposing a sentence of probation. Two years, as the government seeks, we submit would not. So respectfully, your Honor, if the Court is inclined to order probation, we would ask for a one-year period with no time served or supervised release component.

Just to conclude briefly, your Honor, there are a couple of additional points to mention.

To the extent the Court determines that a period of either supervised release or probation is warranted, we respectfully request that the conditions for Mr. Reed be consistent with the terms of probation ordered for his codefendants. So like his codefendants, Mr. Reed should not be subject to any limitations on domestic or international travel. I think the government has agreed to that, your Honor, in their submission. Also should be allowed to maintain contact with Mr. Hayes and Mr. Delo as they have been allowed to maintain contact with him, and in all other respects should be similar

to the conditions for them as well.

Finally, the PSR included a couple of — two special conditions that we respectfully submit should not be imposed. The PSR recommended a search condition based on the defendant's criminal conduct, including "fraudulent activity," and second, financial restrictions and disclosure conditions to monitor the defendant's repayment of financial obligations and also to deter the defendant from committing a new offense. These were not conditions imposed on Mr. Hayes or Mr. Delo. Mr. Reed actually has not been accused of any fraud. There's no fraud at issue, and he's already satisfied his \$10 million fine in full. So we would respectfully request that those be set aside.

With that, your Honor, even though I know you will tell me it's not necessary, on behalf of Mr. Reed and my team, we would like to thank you and the court and staff for your time and your consideration throughout this case.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. YATTER: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Reed, have you reviewed the presentence report, the recommendation, and the addendum, and discussed them with your lawyers?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have any objections?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'll listen to you for anything you would like to tell me in connection with sentence, any statement you'd like to make, anything at all you'd like to tell me.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: You can remain seated. Talk into the microphone.

THE DEFENDANT: OK. Appreciate that.

Thank you, your Honor. Appreciate the opportunity to address the Court.

As Mr. Yatter said, I take full responsibility for my role in BitMEX's failure to implement a know-your-customer and anti-money laundering program. When I cofounded BitMEX in Hong Kong, I was young. I was coming off a few unsuccessful startups and trying to find my identity. And two of the most talented people I have ever known wanted to work together on a unique idea in a brand-new space, and obviously I went for it.

For years we operated with very little resources and very little success. When the success suddenly came, the stress was unbelievable. I wasn't prepared for it. My coping mechanism was compartmentalization. I — when I felt out of my depth, I would simply focus on writing code. I tried to narrow my responsibilities so that they would be small enough for me to get my arms around them. Then in doing so, I was complicit in our failures.

This was a mistake. We didn't do enough to ensure that we were not serving U.S. customers, and the result of that has been clear. It's why we're all here today. I deeply regret this mistake. Not only was it wrong, but it's had an enormous effect on others, including my business, my family, and my friends. This head-on experience of the seriousness of my actions has led me to reduce my relationship with the business and focus on my growing family, which has been my top priority all along.

I want to thank my wife for being so strong and supportive through all of this. She is everything to me, as is my family and her family, most of whom are there behind me, just this remarkable collection of my family and friends. So many of the people here took so much time flying and driving and being here for me, just to support me, and it's painful for them to see me like this, see this situation, but I deeply appreciate them coming.

I just wanted to thank you, your Honor, and the court for attention to my case, and I hope that you'll see fit to impose a sentence that allows me to turn the page on this chapter in my life and move on and focus on my family.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Reed.

Mr. Raymond, has the government reviewed the presentence report, the recommendation, and the addendum?

MR. RAYMOND: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the government have any objections?

MR. RAYMOND: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'll listen to you for anything that the government wishes to tell me in connection with sentence.

MR. RAYMOND: Thank you very much, your Honor.

I don't want to reiterate too many points made in our submission, but briefly, your Honor, the government respectfully recommends the sentence recommended by probation in the PSR, which is two years' probation.

A sentence with some form of supervision is appropriate in this case. The points I'd like to highlight, your Honor, are, first, the seriousness of the offense. As your Honor knows, this was a yearlong criminal offense by Mr. Reed and by BitMEX. The government does not dispute, as Mr. Yatter said, that Mr. Reed was not as culpable. He was not a leader in the criminal conduct. However, as a 30 percent owner, he still had the ability to make the decision about whether or not to implement an AML and KYC program.

Mr. Yatter mentioned the resources, that BitMEX in some sense lacked the resources to implement such a program or to strengthen its controls. As your Honor knows, as your Honor can see in the PSR, that statement just is not logical in light of the amount of money the defendant himself and his codefendants earned from this company. As briefed in some

detail with respect to Mr. Hayes' sentencing, the company was highly profitable by late 2017, early 2018 when they could have made the decision, when Mr. Reed could have made the decision to use some of the great resources that they were earning to adopt appropriate controls, including a compliant KYC and AML program.

With respect to Mr. Reed's own role, he did have the technical ability to strengthen the controls. There's some discussion about VPNs and Tor. Your Honor, what the important point that the government respectfully requests that the Court consider is that while Mr. Reed stated to customers sometimes not to use VPNs, he knew that they were doing so, and as previously briefed for his codefendants, there were means that the defendant could have implemented to restrict technologically to restrict the use of VPNs on BitMEX.

Your Honor, the other point I'd like to highlight is the need for the sentence imposed to reflect respect for the law. First, as your Honor knows, this was a willful violation of the Bank Secrecy Act, so it showed deep disrespect towards U.S. law. Second, Mr. Yatter mentioned that Mr. Reed had an understanding that some of BitMEX's technological features made it less attractive as an actual source for money laundering. As we point out in our submission, your Honor, that is belied or his understanding of that would be belied by the quantum of regulatory inquiries BitMEX was receiving, many of which he was

included on, which showed that, despite his own understanding based on the technology, regulators were interested because there were allegations and investigations into criminal conduct by users of BitMEX.

Finally, your Honor, I just want to end on the point about a disparity between Mr. Reed and his codefendants. There is no question a sentence of 24 months' probation would be a disparate sentence from that imposed on either Mr. Hayes or Mr. Delo. That sentence, a sentence of some form of supervision, reflects Mr. Reed's important role in the company while also reflecting the fact that he was less culpable than Mr. Hayes or Delo.

With respect to Mr. Reed's prior compliance on bail, as your Honor knows, the relevant factors on bail under 3142 and the Bail Reform Act are different than the applicable factors under the law under 3553(a). Now that Mr. Reed has been convicted, pleading guilty, and the Court is considering imposing sentence, the appropriate conditions are those of 3553(a), and those should reflect the seriousness of the offense, the need to reflect respect for the law, as well as specific and general deterrence.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Raymond.

I'll place the presentence report, the recommendation, and the addendum in the record under seal. I'll also place the

parties' submissions to me in the record under seal. The parties should place their own submissions in the record not under seal after redacting any personal identifying information.

I adopt the findings of fact in the presentence report. Therefore, I conclude that under the current guidelines, the total offense level is six, the criminal history category is I, and the guideline sentencing range is zero to six months.

I appreciate that the guidelines are only advisory and that the Court must consider the various sentencing factors in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a) and impose a sentence that is sufficient, but no greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set forth in Section 3553(a)(2).

In this case, the defendant's guideline sentencing range is in Zone A, and therefore, a sentence consistent with the guidelines is a sentence of probation without a sentence of home confinement for part of the sentence of probation. The probation department recommends a sentence of two years' probation, and the government agrees. The defense urges that the defendant should be sentenced simply to time served, without any other period of supervision.

But as with the codefendants, the Court agrees that the offense is very serious. The defendant was a 30 percent owner of BitMEX and, along with his codefendants, admittedly

caused the company to violate the Bank Secrecy Act by failing to establish anti-money laundering and know-your-customer procedures. As the defendant necessarily admitted for purposes of his plea of guilty to a willful offense, the defendant knew that it was necessary for the company not to serve United States customers in order to avoid the regulatory procedures of the Bank Secrecy Act, but he knew that his company, in fact, serviced United States customers. Given the admittedly willful nature of the violation, the crime was serious.

On the other hand, as the Court made clear with respect to the codefendants, the government chose not to accuse the defendant of money laundering or fraud and was well aware of, or should have been aware of, the guideline range at the time that it entered into the plea agreement with the defendant. Moreover, there are no identifiable victims of the offense and no need for restitution. There has been disgorgement as a result of the defendant's payment of the \$10 million penalty to the CFTC. The penalty also satisfies the fine in this case.

The history and characteristics of the defendant also weigh in the defendant's favor. This is the defendant's first offense, and he has a large and supportive family and a history of charitable contributions.

There is a need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities. In comparing the defendant's possible sentence to

those imposed on his codefendants, the defendant appears to be somewhat less culpable. The defendant did not have a day-to-day supervisory role over the BitMEX employees who continued to carry out the failure to implement the anti-money laundering program. And while the defendant had a supervisory role within BitMEX, it was not a supervisory role in connection with the criminal activity. See generally Presentence Report, paragraph 57.

The government agrees that the defendant is somewhat less culpable than his two codefendants, as reflected in the fact that the stipulated guideline sentencing range for the defendant is in Zone A of the guidelines rather than Zone B for his codefendants. Therefore, the Court agrees that a sentence that is somewhat less than the sentences of his codefendants would avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities.

Therefore, on balance, the Court intends to impose a sentence of 18 months' probation without a condition of home confinement. Probation will be subject to the mandatory and special conditions of supervision listed on pages 44 and 45 of the presentence report. The defendant must cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer. The court will not impose the drug testing condition because the defendant is a low risk of substance abuse. The Court will also not impose the special condition suggested by the probation department at pages 45 and 46 of the presentence

report. There is no need for a search condition or the financial conditions on page 46 in view of the fact that the defendant has already paid his \$10 million fine. Moreover, the defendant will be permitted domestic and international travel and will be permitted to have contact with Messrs. Hayes and Delo.

The defendant's obligation to pay a \$10 million fine has been satisfied by his payment of the \$10 million penalty to the CFTC. The defendant must pay a special assessment of \$100. The Court will not impose restitution because there is no victim under 18 U.S.C. Section 3663. No forfeiture is sought.

The sentence is consistent with the factors in Section 3553(a) and is sufficient, but no greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set forth in Section 3553(a)(2).

I have explained the reasons for the sentence. Before I actually impose the sentence, Mr. Yatter, I'll recognize you for anything you wish to tell me.

MR. YATTER: Thank you, your Honor.

Just as an administrative matter, apart from what you've just said, we'd ask also that pretrial be directed to return Mr. Reed's passport to him and that his \$500,000 payment to secure his appearance bond also be ordered to be returned to him.

THE COURT: Usually I do those in response to a

separate request. If you send me a letter, I'll endorse the letter.

MR. YATTER: We're happy to do that, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. YATTER: Nothing further. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Reed, before I actually impose the sentence, I'll recognize you for anything you wish to tell me, anything you'd like to say, anything at all.

THE DEFENDANT: Nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Raymond, before I actually impose the sentence, I'll recognize you for anything the government wishes to tell me.

MR. RAYMOND: Nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Pursuant to the sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment that the defendant, Samuel Reed, is hereby sentenced to 18 months' probation on Count One.

Within 72 hours, the defendant shall report in person to the probation office in this district. While on probation, the defendant shall comply with the mandatory, standard conditions, and special conditions of probation in this district as listed on pages 44 to 45 of the presentence report.

The drug testing condition is suspended. The defendant must cooperate in the collection of DNA. Domestic

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and international travel is permitted. And the defendant is permitted to have contact with Messrs. Hayes and Delo.

As I've indicated before, I will not impose the search condition on page 45 or the financial conditions on page 46 with respect to providing the probation officer access to any requested financial information and that the defendant must not incur new credit charges. Those will not be imposed.

It is further ordered that the defendant shall pay to the United States a special assessment of \$100, which shall be due immediately.

I've already explained the reasons for the sentence. Does either counsel know of any legal reason why the sentence should not be imposed as I so stated it?

MR. RAYMOND: No, your Honor.

MR. YATTER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I'll order the sentence to be imposed as I have so stated it.

There's a waiver of the right to appeal the sentence, correct?

MR. RAYMOND: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does either counsel know of any legal reason why the waiver is not effective?

MR. RAYMOND: Not from the government.

MR. YATTER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Reed, the reason that I

ask these questions is that generally a defendant has the right to appeal the sentence. The notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days after the entry of the judgment of conviction. The judgment of conviction is entered promptly after the judge announces the sentence. If the defendant cannot pay the cost of appeal, the defendant has the right to apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. If the defendant requests, the clerk will prepare and file a notice of appeal on the defendant's behalf immediately, and the rules require that a judge inform a defendant of this right to appeal.

In this case, the parties advise that you have given up, or waived, your right to appeal the sentence, and I'm confident that when I took your guilty plea, I went over with you the waiver of this right to appeal the sentence. So it appears that you have given up, or waived, your right to appeal the sentence, but I go over this with you now because I want to make sure that you talked to your lawyers about this so that you are fully informed of all of your rights.

Do you understand what I've said?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Government moves to dismiss any open counts?

MR. RAYMOND: That's right, your Honor. That's the S1 indictment entirely and Count Two of the original indictment.

THE COURT: You move to dismiss all of those?

Case 1:20-cr-00500-JGK Document 396 Filed 08/23/22 Page 29 of 29 M7DHReeS MR. RAYMOND: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: And the defense agrees? MR. YATTER: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: All open counts, including the previous indictment, dismissed on the motion of the government. All right. Anything further? MR. RAYMOND: Not from the government, your Honor. MR. YATTER: Nothing here, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Good afternoon, all. MR. RAYMOND: Good afternoon. MR. YATTER: Good afternoon. (Adjourned)